



# City of Carmel

## CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION

June 20, 2006

Minutes

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Carmel Plan Commission met at 6:00 PM on June 20, 2006 in the Council Chambers of City Hall, Carmel, Indiana. The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members present: Jerry Chomanczuk; Leo Dierckman; Wayne Haney; Kevin Heber; Rick Ripma; Carol Schleif; Madeleine Torres, thereby establishing a quorum.

Present on behalf of the Department of Community Services: Matt Griffin, Adrienne Keeling, Christine Holmes, Planning Staff. John Molitor, Legal Counsel was also in attendance.

The minutes of the May 16, 2006 meeting were approved as submitted.

Matt Griffin announced that items 1H, Guerrero Property PUD and 2I, Midtown Village PUD were continued to the July 18, 2006 meeting. The Department is requesting that Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS, Old Meridian Place be returned to the Special Studies Committee, since the rezone failed at the City Council last evening and the petitioner will be altering their plans accordingly.

### H. Public Hearings:

**1H. Docket No. 06010003 Z: Guerrero Property PUD – CONTINUED TO JULY 18**

The applicant seeks to rezone 38.8 acres from S1/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of developing attached single-family residences and townhomes.

The site is located at the northwest corner of Towne Road and 131<sup>st</sup> Street.

Filed by Charles Frankenberger of Nelson and Frankenberger for Indiana Land Development Co.

**2H. Docket No. 06040025 DP Amend/ADLS Amend: Parkwood Garage (Liberty Mutual Group)**

The applicant seeks Development Plan Amendment, Commitment Amendment, and Architectural Design, Lighting, and Signage Amendment approval for 7.81 acres, for the purpose of constructing a three-story parking garage, replacing some existing surface parking.

The site is located at 350 East 96<sup>th</sup> Street and is zoned B6/Business. The site is located within the US 31 Corridor Overlay.

Filed by Paul Reis and Blaine Paul for Liberty Mutual and Duke Construction LP.

Blaine Paul, Duke Construction, 600 East 96<sup>th</sup> Street, Indianapolis appeared before the Commission on behalf of the Indiana Insurance Parking Garage project. Indiana Insurance is a Liberty Mutual Company. Also in attendance was JoAnn Bragg, Director of Facilities; Paul Reis and Steve Granner, Bose McKinney & Evans; Dan Harrington, Duke Construction; Aaron Hashel, CSO Architects.

The petition is for an amended ADLS petition from previous ADLS and Development Plan approvals. The review will also include an amendment to commitments that were made during previous development.

The project is located within the existing Parkwood Development, located north of East 96<sup>th</sup> Street between College Avenue and US 31, just south of I-465. The existing Indiana Insurance building and its relation to existing, surrounding development was highlighted on the overhead map. The proposed parking garage is to be located immediately west of the existing building. The zoning for this particular parcel is B-6 and the proposed use as a parking garage does fit within the zoning classification.

The parking lot located immediately west of the building is to be removed as part of this project—125 total parking stalls. There is an existing tree area located just south of the parking lot and a portion of the tree area will be removed for the parking garage project. The parking lot will have two primary points of access—one onto 96<sup>th</sup> Street, and one with direct access to Parkwood Crossing Boulevard—the private ring road that loops to East 96<sup>th</sup> Street.

In the existing condition, there are 582 parking stalls. The proposed site plan for the parking garage was displayed showing the four levels of parking for a net gain of 426 parking stalls. There will be a future total of 1,008 parking stalls. Ingress will be very similar to the existing parking lot. AT the northeast corner of the garage, ingress and egress will be accommodated into level two. There are two points for pedestrian access into the garage facility. At the northwest corner there will be a stair tower; also at the middle point of the east face of the garage there will be pedestrian access. The eastern stair tower is anticipated to be the primary access for pedestrians, since it does align with the existing sidewalk to the primary entrance into the facility.

A comment was received from the Department of Community Services regarding bicycle parking and that was not a part of the original plan. However, the petitioner is currently proposing eight (8) bicycle parking spaces at the front of the building. A portion of the existing landscaping will be removed to accommodate this project. The petitioner has worked with the Department and the Urban Forester to develop a landscape plan that mitigates the loss of landscaping and also blends nicely with the new garage.

The north yard will be a Level “A” buffer yard as well as the west line. South of the garage, the petitioner has bumped up the buffer to Level “B” pursuant to the request and recommendations of

the Department Staff. It should be noted that there are several mature trees on the premises, and the petitioner is making every effort to maintain those plantings. There are three evergreen trees that will remain at the corner—a primary view from I-465. Additionally, the west lot line is a mature, wooded lot line and that area is to remain. Every effort has been made to ensure that these areas will not be disturbed during construction. There is also a large, existing wooded area south of the garage that will be maintained as a part of this project. A fence protection detail is located on the construction site that will warn construction equipment to stay out of those sensitive areas.

The lighting fixtures are wall-mounted, shoebox style fixtures and will be utilized to light the adjacent grade areas around the parking garage, including surface parking lots as well as pedestrian walkways. There are also pole-mounted fixtures that will be located on the top level of the garage, also shoebox style fixtures with flat lenses. The poles are 20 feet tall; 250 watt metal halide fixtures that result in a whiter light. Lighting levels adjacent to the private ring road and the west lot line vary anywhere from zero (0) to one point two (1.2) at the absolute maximum. There is no public right-of-way adjacent to this particular project. There are two more light fixtures to the west of the garage that will be utilized to light the surface parking lot and the petitioner has provided pole mounted fixtures, since the neighbor to the west prefers to not have wall-mounted units facing their facility and cut-off shields will be provided to minimize the amount of light spillage.

The location of the stair tower is centrally located in order to align with existing sidewalks located on the south side of the building. In the north elevation, the garage appears to be a grade plus two structure; from the south and west elevation, the garage appears as a grade plus three structure. The reason is that existing grade falls from north to south rather significantly across the property and the best way to accommodate that is through the current design where one and one-half levels of the garage are below grade and all other areas are open.

The garage also features two completely enclosed stair towers. The garage material is architectural, pre-cast that matches the pre-cast on the existing building. The glass utilized in the stair tower will be a green color to match the existing facility as well. The garage height is 36 feet, 3 inches as proposed and the commitment amendment requests this height allowance. Two buildings east of this building in Parkwood V development there is a garage immediately adjacent to the building that is this same height. The current proposal is one that has been proposed, approved and constructed previously at Parkwood Development.

Regarding Signage, there is no informational signage proposed at this time. The only signage proposed is that related to directing traffic into the garage as well as signage associated with the emergency exits, etc.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of or opposition to the petition; no one appeared and the public hearing was closed.

Department Report, Matt Griffin: The petitioner does currently meet the lighting ordinance. The Department is recommending this item be forwarded to the Special Studies Committee for further discussion on June 29, 2006 and that the petitioner bring item 2 in the Department Report that is listed as outstanding.

Jerry Chomanczuk commented that this proposal adds a tremendous amount of parking for a building that already has an approved parking ratio. With the current parking available, the proposed parking computes to a 7 or 8 to one parking ratio.

Mr. Paul responded that the existing condition of the parking computes to 3.2 and the completed product will be at 3.9 per thousand. The facility is 180,000 square feet. Correction: 5.6 per thousand.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked that the Department double check the numbers and have that information available at the Committee level. It looks like a tremendous amount of parking is being added to this area—apparently the nature of the jobs within the building is changing to some degree. The other concern is that currently, when driving 96<sup>th</sup> Street, there is a rent-a-cop directing traffic in/out of the area. The concern is that with the current level of traffic volume in and out of Parkwood, adding another 550 automobiles to the area is a tremendous amount that is already exacerbated by having a rent-a-cop during lunch time and peak AM and PM hours. It seems that this is already a problem area.

Blaine Paul commented that the building was originally designed and approved as a corporate headquarters type of use. The building is changing to become more of a data center type of use and there are more jobs and employees coming into the building in the proposed condition. Regarding the 3.9 number thrown out earlier, Parkwood as an over-all development is currently at 3.5 per thousand and is now as built-out as can be from a total square footage perspective. Once the additional parking stalls are included, the 3.9 per thousand is still a very typical parking ratio for this type of development. The development is not over-parked, but the site on its own is a little higher than the average of the buildings around it.

Mr. Paul pointed out that Parkwood is currently working on significant road improvement project for 96<sup>th</sup> Street that will go from the west entrance/exit of Parkwood and will head west, across Meridian Street and conclude in a round about at Spring Mill Road. Part of that improvement project will add a designated right turn lane from the western-most curb cut over to US 31 that will help significantly with the traffic issues in the region. A formal response regarding the parking and traffic will be prepared for response at the Special Studies Committee meeting.

Jerry Chomanczuk also expressed concern regarding the aesthetics from I-465 that will be an island of light poles next to very attractive office buildings. It may be appropriate to put a roof on the structure and “green” it. The Committee should pay particular attention to the view from 465 of the light poles.

Rick Ripma felt that the parking requirement is a minimum, not a maximum and that adding additional parking would be a good thing for the most part—not a bad thing. It does seem that this development is currently very short on parking. If the structure can be designed to have a good look from 465, it would be beneficial. Can the front of the garage structure be designed to look like an office building?

Mr. Paul thought it would draw more attention to the structure if it were designed to look like an office building.

Leo Dierckman asked if a rendering could be done from I-465; the petitioner was willing to do that. Wayne Haney felt that the garage was nicely integrated into the site and he liked the low profile of the building. Perhaps the pre-cast panels should be more muted in shades to draw attention away from the garage rather than the building.

Blaine Paul responded that the intent was to match the existing pre-cast color on the existing building. The petitioner undertook to bring in samples and photographs of the existing building for Committee review as well as some other complimentary colors for Committee input.

Docket No. 06040025 DP Amend/ADLS Amend, Parkwood Garage (Liberty Mutual Group) was referred to the Special Studies Committee on June 29, 2006 at 6:00 PM for further review.

**3H. Docket No. 06050001 Z: Legacy/East Carmel PUD Rezone**

The applicant seeks to rezone 509.234 acres from S-1 to Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a primarily residential, mixed-use development. The site is located north of 126<sup>th</sup> Street, south of 146<sup>th</sup> Street, and on either side of River Road. Filed by Steve Pittman and Paul Rioux of Pittman Properties.

Steve Pittman, Nick Churchill, and Neal Smith, Pittman Partners, appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Steve Fehribach and Tom Vandenberg, A & F Engineering; Jud Scott, Vine and Branch; Mr. Blaneck, Williams Creek Consulting; Charlie Frankenberger, attorney with Nelson & Frankenberger. Jim Shumaker and Paul Rioux were also present.

The proposed project is named “The Legacy” and will be a project that everyone will be proud of. Pittman Partners will be working with the neighbors, Earlham, Connor Prairie, and the City in order to provide a legacy. Earlham College decided in January 2005 that they would sell the subject property. In February 2005, NAI Olympia Partners was hired to market this site to the world. Earlham started their due diligence in January 2005 and it continued through January 2006. Earlham filed a plat on this property in 2005 in order to preserve the zoning. In March 2006, Pittman Partners made a presentation to the Earlham Board and on March 28, 2006, Earlham officially selected Pittman Partners as the builder/developer for this site and the contract was signed in April.

Steve Pittman showed site location maps—to the north is 146<sup>th</sup> Street, adjacent to Noblesville; the site is also adjacent to Fishers. The location is really a “gateway” off 146<sup>th</sup> Street. The aerial photograph was shown; the site consists of two parcels—the parcel to the north is contiguous to 146<sup>th</sup> Street and to the west of River Road. There is a second parcel that runs from River Road to the White River. There are actually two sites: the area west of River Road that contains 413 acres, and the area to the east of River Road that contains 95.8 acres.

The south property line is adjacent to Haverstick; the western border is adjacent to several larger

metes and bounds tracks with individual curb cuts off of Cherry Tree, also adjacent to Pulte Homes. The east property line is adjacent to the White River. The surrounding uses include Lochaven Development to the west (part of Noblesville) an apartment development under construction by Pedcor Development, (part of a tax credit project) a mobile home park to the east (in Noblesville) to the south is the Prairie Trace Elementary School and the Haverstick Community developed by Centex Homes. Continuing to the west is a Pulte neighborhood consisting of 363 units with a density of 2.02 units per acre.

The majority of the woodland areas and slopes will be preserved. There will be “pocket parks” and a water feature; Cherry Tree Road will be extended through The Legacy and will connect as well as the road from the Centex community of Haverstick Subdivision. As previously mentioned, 146<sup>th</sup> is the northern boundary and is the major County road that will run from I-69 to I-65; currently there are approximately 29,000 traffic units that travel on this road. The proposed plan provides for a major entry or primary parkway opposite the apartment complex. The primary parkway will extend through the Legacy site and run from Hazel Dell Parkway, through Cherry Creek Estates, through The Legacy, and continue to River Road. River Road to the east divides the property; currently it has a traffic volume of a little over 6,000 units.

The proposed PUD calls for a mixed-use area containing offices, retail, townhomes, apartments, and assisted living area. The office area will not exceed 100,000 square feet; the retail will not exceed 110,000 square feet. The assisted living area consists of approximately 19 acres. The townhomes will consist of approximately 437 units—two story and three story products, and anticipated for sale over a 7 to 10 year period. All garage doors are tucked behind the units and will not be visible from any perimeter road. The multi-family area will not exceed 250 units. The 40-foot wide product is part of a traditional neighborhood design concept with pocket parks and alleyways. The alleys would be private and maintained by the development. The plan also provides for a 50-foot wide product, a 60-foot wide product, and a 65-foot wide and 70-foot wide product. There is also a 90-foot wide lot that will include custom homes, side-entry garages and brick wrap.

The plan provides for 45% open space that will be useable by the residents. There are also over 7 miles of trails wrapped and integrated into not only the Legacy community but the surrounding neighborhoods as well.

There is a an area consisting of 95 acres—15 acres of the area are useable and buildable; however, Connor Prairie will continue to own this 95 acres and will reserve the right to build a product in the future that would comply to S-1 standards. The remaining 80 acres is being shown as open space, un-used and unimproved prairie ground.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor of the petition; no one appeared. Members of the public were invited to speak in opposition to the petition; the following appeared:

Public Remonstrance/Unfavorable:

**Karen Carter**, 918 East Auman Drive, Carmel had more questions than comments. Who will build the public school? The project will probably warrant at least two elementary schools. How will

Carmel handle more traffic on 146<sup>th</sup> Street and I-69, and how long will this project take?

**Peter Langowski**, 5322 Rippling Brook Way, 10-year resident of Carmel, asked if the public hearing could remain open throughout the process to allow for full participation from the public. Mr. Langowski said he and his neighbors are not really opposed to this property being developed with residential uses, including assisted living, but with limited, non-regional commercial activity. Mr. Langowski was concerned about the density and the pricing of the products. Mr. Langowski asked that the Commission look at the density of not just the adjoining, neighboring subdivisions but several miles in each direction as well. Designing into the context of surrounding suburban development, we need to recognize the 40 years of planning that have brought us to where we are today and the collective wisdom of all of the subdivisions to the west and south. Since this particular property is the last big piece in the puzzle of finishing off orderly growth on this side of town, Mr. Langowski felt the density was a bit high, and no matter how many bike paths or large contiguous open spaces may be visible from adjacent roadways, it would not help create an attachment to the existing neighborhoods.

**Paul McDowell**, 14402 Bryn Mawr, Fishers immediately to the east of the White River, overlooking the subject site. Mr. McDowell said he also had a concern regarding the density of the development that was apparently computed utilizing the flood plain area. When the flood plain area is removed from the equation, the density is considerably higher than the adjacent neighborhoods and the resulting traffic, along with the existing, will be a noise issue and will only get worse. It is not unreasonable to project that we will see an influx of traffic with 1300 units—2 to 3 thousand cars—and it would seem that the offer put forth from Earlham must be one of the higher ones of the table if it is to this point and contingent upon the rezoning. However, it would seem that by leaving the zoning as S-1, there would be a less dense situation of housing; it may not bring as high a price for Earlham College, but it would be in the best interest of Carmel and the congestion in this area that we are starting to see grow exponentially on 146<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Larry Blanken**, 8050 East 146<sup>th</sup> Street, echoed concerns regarding the density, especially when removing the flood plain or flood way—the density exceeds 3 and well exceeds the 2.7 predicted. Again, the traffic congestion along 146<sup>th</sup> Street has already increased dramatically since he built in this area in 2000 and it will increase a lot more when the area is opened at two ends. This development will also add to that traffic congestion and directly impact Mr. Blanken's well being, since his driveway actually exits onto 146<sup>th</sup> Street. In addition, commercial and apartments and just the overall density is too high in Carmel compared to the other residential areas that are zoned S-1. This property should remain S-1 and not be changed.

**Rabi Surapaneni**, 14052 Sourwood Lane, Haverstick Subdivision community—expressed concern regarding density, access, price point of the units and preservation of property values. Mr. Surapaneni was also concerned that traffic would cut through his subdivision to gain access to 146<sup>th</sup> Street thru River Road.

**Chrisina Enney**, 14097 Plantationwood Lane, requested more information on the multi-family homes and the quality of those homes. Ms. Enney asked if the tree line would be preserved behind the yellow section shown; questioned the scale of the representations.

Rebuttal: Charlie Frankenberger, attorney, responded to comments. In regard to the schools, the properties will deliver a substantial assessed valuation without considerable impact on the schools. The commercial development produces no impact on the schools, and the nature of the residential development is such that it produces relatively few school age children—this development will more than pay for itself. Regarding comments about commercial development—commercial is proposed primarily on 146<sup>th</sup> Street and is believed to be appropriate as presented. The tree line to the southwest of the development will be preserved.

The public hearing was then closed.

Jerry Chomanczuk noted that at the Committee level, items are left open for public input. In a project of this magnitude, it will probably be at committee for review at least two months and the Commission would like for public input at that time as well. This item will be forwarded to the Special Studies Committee.

Charlie Frankenberger reported that there are 95 acres east of River Road, 80 of which are shown as open space. It was Charlie's understanding that there is an agreement between Connor Prairie and Earlham College that permits the petitioner to characterize the 80 acres east of River Road only as passive open space—it cannot be characterized otherwise. It also prevents proposals for any uses for the 80 acres that are more limiting than S-1 Zoning restrictions and the floodplain loss. The agreement between Earlham College and Connor Prairie and in turn, the agreement between Earlham College and The Legacy, permits 80 of the 95 acres to be used as open space. This parcel must remain zoned S-1 and unaffected by the PUD process.

The PUD divides open space into what is east of River Road and open space west of River Road. The open space west of River Road does not have constraints on it—the open space east of River Road provides that it must remain passive open space and the petitioner cannot impose restrictions greater than S-1. Regarding the 15-acre strip, the PUD says that it remains S-1 zoning and is unaffected by the PUD and governed solely by Carmel Zoning Ordinances.

Leo Dierckman commented that if the 80-acre parcel was utilized in the calculation of density, Earlham and Connor Prairie need to agree that it will be public parkland on a permanent basis to serve the public. It needs to be available to the public. We also need to study all of the property lines that abut on the western boundary so that there are appropriate setbacks. The product types being introduced are different than those existing, contiguous uses. Density will certainly be an issue and we will spend a lot of time reviewing this.

Rick Ripma asked if the 15-acre strip was included in the density calculation. Also, what types of paths run through the property? In addition, the drawing shown of 146<sup>th</sup> is different than it appears today—is the petitioner doing the improvements?

Charlie Frankenberger responded that the 15-acre parcel was not included in the density calculation; however, Charlie would verify and report. Charlie said the petitioner is flexible regarding the paths. Hardscape might be more intrusive than the natural environment and the



petitioner is in dialogue with the Urban Forester regarding the paths.

Steve Pittman reported that 146<sup>th</sup> Street is shown as it is today. However, according to the traffic study submitted by A & F Engineering, Legacy will be required to do some roadway improvements if the proposed plan is approved.

Wayne Haney noted that there is a lot of open space shown, however it gives no relief to the people within the development—4 pocket parks for the 40-foot wide townhomes, but in the other areas, there are no park areas allotted. 80 acres close to White River will not alleviate the congestion in the housing area.

Kevin Heber commented that the neighborhood retail center looks as if it will work as a community vitality node as defined in the Comprehensive Plan. Just to remind everyone, currently there is nothing in Carmel like that. Is there anything outside of Chicago that looks like what is proposed? Kevin also asked about the possibility of an historic bridge over White River to connect Connor Prairie with Carmel. If this is accomplished, we would like to carry that towards downtown. There are a couple of different ways to get there—one is 131<sup>st</sup> Street that hooks up to the White River Greenway and shown on the Carmel Alternative Transportation Plan. The petitioner may wish to consider help funding the construction of the trail on the levee, at least in the section included in The Legacy property. Once across the White River, Kevin said he would like to see an easy flow through the middle of the Legacy development either by bike lane or accessible bike path along the main thoroughfare (Cherry Tree east/west extension.) Another way would be to take the trail as shown on the proposal and make it flow straight across as much as possible. Also, connecting the Prairie Trace School would be desirable by way of a cut through the cul-de-sac. Kevin encouraged the petitioner to work with the School for a possible connection—as many as three—one along River Road, one in the cul-de-sac, and one in the middle of Cherry Tree extension directly north of Prairie Trace.

Steve Pittman responded that it is looked as a “community vitality node” and neighborhood retail. There is nothing seen like that in this area—Charlotte, NC has a lot of desirable areas—retail and office will be incorporated, it is just not known at this time what it will look like.

Carol Schleif asked for more detail and referred to a Kansas City PUD as an example. In the big picture, Carol said she was concerned with how many people will be in this area away from the center of the City without benefit of a bus line, etc. On the other side, this is a great location for some commercial—there is absolutely nothing in this area. Gardens/courtyards would be beneficial to the residents. Rather than townhomes in a row, Carol suggested a different configuration rather than monotonous rows. Trails are good to help break up the monotony. Useable open space on the west side is preferable. Noise between the restaurant area and residential in the evening hours might be a problem. The universal design guidelines available through the Department would be helpful.

Carol will submit a list to the Staff to be incorporated into the Committee packet for review.

Jerry Chomanczuk commented that he was also concerned about the infrastructure and whether or not River Road can handle the capacity, the school population, the mitigation of the wetlands on the

property, and the multi-family section that has very little detail.

Madeleine Torres had one initial observation—perhaps put the largest lots, the 90-foot single family lots on the south corner; on the west side too, give more buffer for the Haverstick neighborhood.

**Docket No. 06050001 Z, Legacy/East Carmel PUD Rezone** was referred to the **Special Studies Committee** for further review at 6:00 PM on June 29, 2006.

John Molitor, Legal Counsel clarified from the Rules that the Committee shall not conduct a further, additional public hearing after the public hearing has been formally closed. However, the chairperson of the committee does have the discretion to allow for comments and questions from the public in any matter, subject to disallowing repetitious and irrelevant testimony.

John Molitor wanted to make it clear that the public hearing is now closed on Docket No. 06050001 Z, Legacy; however, the Chairperson will be able to take additional public comments at the Committee level.

## **I. Old Business**

### **1I. Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS: Old Meridian Place**

The applicant seeks to create 129 townhomes and a mix of office and retail uses on 25 acres.

The site is located at 12852 Old Meridian Street and is zoned OM/SFA.

Filed by Jon Isaacs for Centex Homes.

Matt Griffin reported that the petitioner is requesting that this item be returned to the Special Studies Committee. Last evening, a portion of this site was to be rezoned to accommodate the proposed site plan. The rezone was not approved and the petitioner is now “tweaking” the acreage to accommodate the revised site plan to meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

A motion would need to be made by the Commission to return this item to Committee to review the revised site plan.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to **return Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS, Old Meridian Place to the Special Studies Committee on June 29, 2006** for further review, seconded by Carol Schleif, approved 7-0.

### **2I. Docket No. 06010008 Z: Midtown Village PUD**

The applicant seeks to rezone 18.82 acres from I1/Industrail to PUD for the purpose of creating mixed use development.

The site is located at 510 Third Avenue SW and is zoned I1/Industrial.

Filed by Lawrence Kemper of Nelson and Frankenberger for Centex Homes.

**Continued to July 18, 2006**

3I. **Docket No: 05120025 Z 126<sup>th</sup> & Keystone/Gramercy PUD**

The applicant seeks to rezone 116 acres from R2/Residential and R4/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a mixed use development comprised of townhouse, apartment, retail, and office uses.

The site is located between Carmel Drive, 126<sup>th</sup> Street, Keystone Ave, and Auman Dr.

Filed by James Shinaver of Nelson & Frankenberger for Buckingham Properties Inc.

David Leazenby, Buckingham Companies appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Brad Chambers and Sara Nasuti, Buckingham Companies; Jim Shinaver, attorney with Nelson & Frankenberger; Gary Murray, Schneider Engineering; Steve Fehribach and Tom Vanderberg, A & F Engineering.

David Leazenby reported that the Special Studies Committee had voted a positive recommendation (4-0) to send this matter back to the full Commission. The matter has been in Committee for review for approximately six (6) months.

The petitioner submitted a proposed ordinance and set of design guidelines to form the framework for a new neighborhood called "Gramercy." The proposal is for the redevelopment of Mohawk Hills that will evolve over the next 10 to 12 years. The proposal is for the rezoning only for the property—if approved, any ADLS petition that follows would be held to the Ordinance and the strict guidelines outlined.

Mohawk Hills was developed in the early 1970's on 116 acres and includes 564 apartment homes. There was a time when Mohawk Hills was considered one of the most luxurious apartment communities on the north side. Over the last decade, the project has faced tough competition from other properties, many of which offer modern amenities and newer facilities. Mohawk Hills has suffered from years of disinvestment, infrequent maintenance, and has some deteriorating buildings as well. Mohawk contains only one point of access and a confusing street network.

Buckingham purchased the apartments and the golf course in 2004 and began studying ideas to create a plan that was better than the initial plan in 1969. Carmel has invested a lot of time and money in other plans in the City of Carmel such as Old Town, the Arts & Design District, City Center, Old Meridian Corridor, the Meridian Corporate Corridor, many street improvement projects, Design Guidelines, Comprehensive Plan, Urban Design Initiative, etc., etc. It was determined that Mohawk Hills should have its own plan for redevelopment that would be consistent with all other efforts. It was also determined that the plan should consider the existing neighborhoods, the adjacent commercial uses, and its proximity to City Center.

Several objectives were established. 1) Consistency with the urban core. 2) Replacement of the existing limited access and confusing street network with more logical, pedestrian friendly street patterns. 3) Inclusion of a variety of housing options—not solely apartments—and would also include a mixture of uses including housing, shops, civic buildings, etc. so that not every trip had to be made by one car. 4) Design Guidelines that would ensure architectural quality as well as

diversity. There have been many changes since the original design due to neighborhood involvement from Cool Creek, Hunters Glen, Auman Addition and The Enclave as well as the Committee review. The plan would not be the same without the contribution of the time, effort, and ideas from these neighborhoods.

The connection to 126<sup>th</sup> Street was talked about as well as the connections to Auman Drive, Keystone and Carmel Drive. The City Thoroughfare Plan was talked about and the connection from 126<sup>th</sup> Street to Carmel Drive and INDOT regarding a connection at Keystone Avenue. The resulting concept plan shows more detail.

A phasing plan was also created for the project. The Ordinance now stipulates that until this property has direct access to Carmel Drive or direct access to Keystone Avenue, the petitioner can only re-develop 50% of the land area. Therefore, there is a definite incentive to acquire the property to the south as well as the connection to Keystone from INDOT. Until either one of those connections occur, the petitioner is only allowed to develop up to 50% of the site. The plan also provides detail as to where the uses will be located, how much commercial there will be, and where it will be located. There is also a commercial “cap” on the neighborhood to give assurance that it will be residential in character—the cap is 150,000 square feet. Another fine-tuning of the Ordinance was the recognition of 126<sup>th</sup> Street/Keystone intersection as an important gateway to the City Center area. It was also important to the neighbors to have 126<sup>th</sup> Street as “For Sale, Residential Only” at a lower scale of building height. Both the Committee and the petitioner recognized that this particular site had a special place in the City and it was worked out that any proposal at the corner of 126<sup>th</sup> & Keystone, east of the eastern entrance to Gramercy would have to go before the Board of Zoning Appeals to use approval. The total number of uses was also reduced.

There was a lot of discussion revolving around the appearance and the impact this project would have at its periphery. There were many changes to the Ordinance and the Exhibits. Unlike today, there will be no apartments at this location—the first two rows are solely residential—For Sale units.

In order to keep communications going with the neighbors, the petitioner committed thru the PUD Ordinance that additional notice would be given to the neighboring residents beyond the legal requirements to the presidents of Homeowners Associations.

In summary, the PUD Ordinance and Design Guidelines have changed to reflect the input from the Committee, the Department, and the neighboring communities. The PUD Ordinance has been checked, double-checked, and reviewed by the Staff and Engineers, and everyone has the assurance that this is what the City is going to get. Buckingham is hoping and expecting Gramercy will be one of the most exciting projects in Carmel over the next decade.

Department Report, Matt Griffin: As presented this evening, the Department no longer has outstanding concerns with this project and is in support. As such, the Department is recommending that this item be forwarded to the City Council with a positive recommendation.

Committee Report, Leo Dierckman: As noted, the Committee did spend a considerable amount of

time in reviewing this project. There were approximately 7 committee meetings with community involvement and on-going public input. Special Thanks should be accorded to Angie Molt and John Sullivan who represented their neighborhoods extremely well. The next stage of this project will be at the City Council level. The Committee paid particular attention to the impact on the Auman Addition as well as the overall project's traffic impact on the community. The Committee relied upon the City's expertise and the staff available in the Engineering Department and preparing areas for this type of density as well as the mitigation concepts. The additional safety valve in place is the 50% requirement before anything can be further developed until Keystone or Carmel Drive access is open. From a planning standpoint, this is a very well thought out project at this time—much study has been done and there is a lot of detail within the plan and commitments relative to quality, open space, caps on commercial uses, etc. Gramercy will be residential in nature. The density will be somewhat of a political decision in this location. The community is not completely happy with this proposal and it will need more work, however, the Committee has done everything it could possibly do to make sure this is acceptable to move on to the City Council.

Committee member Madeledine Torres said that from a planning perspective, they have gone over this project so much—section by section—and their work is completed. This project is ready to send on to the next phase of the process. The neighbors have been extremely involved and although some community members are not satisfied with the final project, they are in agreement that this needs to be sent on to the next step.

Leo reminded the Commission that this would be seen again as a part of the ADLS process.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked who would monitor Gramercy—who calculates the percentages--Buckingham, the City? There was a similar scenario with the Village of WestClay. Jerry also asked about the 10% minor alterations; however, this is a really big project. Do we need to incorporate stronger language in the PUD regarding the 10% alterations?

Matt Griffin responded that the Department would be monitoring and tracking as the DP/ADLS proposals come before the Commission—there would be a running tally in the master file. The Department would do the due diligence. Regarding the 10%, Matt said he would not oppose stronger language.

Jim Shinaver, attorney explained the intent—10% refers to the definitions of minor and substantial alterations. It was envisioned similar to similar PUD projects. If a minor change of 10% were to occur in an individual section, the Director would be permitted to review and approve. If the change was more than 10%, it would be a substantial alteration and would have to come back before the full Plan Commission.

Jerry Chomanczuk referred to the streetscapes that will appear on 126<sup>th</sup> Street and East Auman. The gaps are OK between the buildings, but what is planned for those gaps—lawn, or space for a car? Jerry suggested planting trees as a screen for the alleyways. Traffic is still a major concern, but what is alleviating part of that concern is the anticipated phasing of construction.

David Leazenby said that the ADLS process allows review of those particular phases under the

standards and design guidelines as they are brought before the Commission and the Committee.

Carol Schleif would like to see more detail such as site plan, building footprints, and more open space incorporated into the plan. Commercial is seen intruding into the residential area; building heights are a concern as well as building separations. A tree preservation plan would have been good as well as preservation of the existing lake. It would also be good to have some linear trails. There should be no access into Auman Drive. If there were some sort of easement or pocket parks at key locations that could be opened in the future—in the meantime, there would be more green space. Density is an issue as well as the number of uses in the project. In the big picture, Carol said she would like to see how the access onto Carmel Drive would work. This is a huge project, and it needs more work.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to **forward Docket No. 05120025 Z, 126<sup>th</sup> & Keystone/Gramercy PUD to the City Council** with a positive recommendation, seconded by Madeleine Torres, Approved 6 in favor, one opposed (Schleif.)

- 4I. **Docket No. 06030003 DP Amend/ADLS: REI Medical Office Building**  
The applicant seeks to build a 2-story, 34,000-sq ft medical office building on 7.54 acres.  
The site is located at 11911 North Pennsylvania St. and is zoned B-6/US 31 Overlay.  
Filed by Joseph Scimia for REI Real Estate Services, Inc.

Joe Scimia, attorney, Baker & Daniels, 600 East 96<sup>th</sup> Street appeared before the Commission representing the applicant.

Through the efforts and work of the Committee, this proposal is now a superior project than originally presented to the Commission. At no time throughout this process has there been any official opposition or remonstrance, other than Leo Dierckman's concern with the side elevation of the project.

When initially presented, there were some concerns with the east elevation of the site, since it does face Pennsylvania Street. There were also concerns regarding the landscaping and site design. The petitioner has worked through those issues. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of this petition. A revised set of elevations was submitted that shows the changes to the east elevation and adopts a treatment similar to that on the west side to provide symmetrical and aesthetic treatment.

The concerns of the Urban Forester have also been addressed in respect to the landscape plan. The landscape plan has been integrated into not only this particular phase of the development but the prior phase as well that upgrades the entire site.

Again, this petition did receive a unanimous recommendation for approval from the Committee and at this time, the petitioner is requesting approval from the full Commission.

Department report, Matt Griffin: The Department is recommending approval of this project; all outstanding concerns have been resolved.

Leo Dierckman reported for the Committee. This project will probably clean up a site that has been a little awkward. The eastern elevation has dramatically improved and the Committee voted a unanimous, favorable recommendation.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06030003 DP Amend/ADLS: REI Medical Office Building**, seconded by Madeleine Torres, **APPROVED 7-0**.

5I. **Docket No. 06030008 Z: 1003 E. 106th Street Rezone**

The applicant seeks a rezone from R3 to B5 to allow neighborhood scale office/commercial use.

The site is located 1003 E. 106<sup>th</sup> Street and is zoned R3 Residential/within the Home Place Business District Overlay.

Filed by Michael Godfrey of Brunson and Company.

Michael Godfrey appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Mr. Godfrey and wife purchased this property in 1997 and operated an insurance agency for approximately three years. From that point until now, the property has been utilized as a residential rental.

The petitioner is requesting a rezone to B-5 to allow office/commercial use. Recent improvements include a roof, asphalt drive, and interior/exterior remodeling. It is hopeful that the trend will be noted by surrounding property owners and the area will be up-graded. At this time, the petitioner is requesting a favorable recommendation.

Department Report, Matt Griffin: The Rezone is fully supported by the Zoning Ordinance as well as the Department Staff. The Department is recommending that this item be forwarded to the City Council with a favorable recommendation.

Committee Report, Leo Dierckman: Nothing further to add at this time. The petitioner has made significant improvements to the property and those improvements are seen as an upgrade to the area; the Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval.

Carol Schleif asked about the possibility of someone constructing a 4-story office building at this location.

Matt Griffin responded that the property falls within the Home Place Business District Overlay and the height is capped at a maximum of 35 feet. There is also an architectural requirement that limits buildings to two stories maximum, and a maximum of 15,000 square feet of floor area.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to **forward Docket No. 06030008 Z, 1003 East 106<sup>th</sup> Street Rezone to the City Council with a positive recommendation**, seconded by Madeleine Torres, **Approved 7** in favor, none opposed.

6I. **Docket No. 06010025 DP/ADLS: Huntington National Bank**

The applicant seeks Development Plan, Architectural Design, and Lighting approval for 1.155 acres, for the purpose of building a bank on an outlot on a larger retail commercial parcel.

The site is located at 10925 North Michigan Road and is zoned B2/Business.

Filed by Brad Schneider of Professional Design Group for Huntington National Bank.

Brad Schneider, Professional Design Group appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. This petition was initially presented to the Plan Commission in May and reviewed by the Special Studies Committee June 6, 2006.

The proposed Bank is within the Weston Pointe Development and is located at the corner of the site. A bike rack has been added. The traffic circulation is now all one way around the building. The site lighting plan has been provided and the landscaping plan has been revised.

The petitioner will be seeking a variance through the Board of Zoning Appeals for the parking on site.

The signage for the Huntington National Bank will be heard at the Special Studies Committee on June 29, 2006.

Department Report, Matt Griffin: The signage portion of this petition is still at the Committee level and will be discussed June 29, 2006. All outstanding comments and concerns have been resolved at this time and the Department is in support of the Development Plan portion of this petition.

Committee Report, Leo Dierckman: The construction is a typical bank building and meets the Michigan Road, 421 Overlay. The Committee will review the sign package June 29, 2006. The Committee voted a favorable recommendation (4-0) on the Development Plan.

Leo Dierckman made formal motion to approve Docket No. 06010025 DP Huntington National Bank (excluding the ADLS Sign Package) and allow the Special Studies Committee to grant final action on the sign package, seconded by Carol Schleif, Approved 7-0.

7I. **Docket No. 06020006 PUD: Aramore PUD**

The applicant seeks a rezone to create 150 townhomes & 72 courthomes on 27.35 ac.

The site is located near the SE corner of Westfield Blvd and 99<sup>th</sup> St. and is zoned S2.

Filed by Nick Churchill of Pittman Partners Inc.

Steve Pittman appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Neal Smith and Nick Churchill, Pittman Partners.

The petitioner has been at the Subdivision Committee for review for the last three months and has



now received a 4-1 favorable recommendation. At this time, the petitioner is asking that the full Commission forward this item to the City Council with a favorable recommendation.

This project started with 222 residential units; it has been reduced to 201 units. The petitioner has now provided multiple elevations and has incorporated new architectural design guidelines as recently proposed by the Department. In addition, there are now multiple elevations of the court homes.

The petitioner is also establishing connectivity with the ten-foot asphalt trail that will be built along Westfield Boulevard as well as a trail from Westfield Boulevard all the way to the back of the neighborhood. This is an area that has been separated out with a lot of stub roads, vacant space, and streets that just cut off. The trails will start the concept of community and inner-connectivity. However, the people that live on Maple Drive have a concern with the connection occurring. The neighbors still do not want the connection to occur; however, the connection can be built and ballards installed to make it very pedestrian friendly.

Steve Pittmann responded to a letter received from Pat Rice that requested that this proposal not be continued. Pat was in agreement with comments made for connection of future development as the market demands. The Overlay Map prepared at the request of the Wild Cherry Corner offers flexible, predictability. It is believed that the proposal will help mitigate the drainage problem. Water that does not get to the Aramore property and is stranded out there on other streets will not be picked up.

Also, one of the things requested is that a traffic study be done for the entire special study area. Steve Pittman committed that he would work with the appropriate parties to determine how to go about dealing with any wildlife issue that may exist and animals will be trapped and removed from the site—the petitioner will be sensitive to that. A community meeting will be held to explain the project and advise what the community can expect in terms of a timetable and process, including landscape changes. Everyone within the study area will be notified of the date, time, and place of the meeting and Pat Rice has agreed to help facilitate this meeting.

All of the improvements to be done as off-site road and drainage will be done in cooperation with the Engineering Department.

Department Report, Matt Griffin: The Department supports the rezone and at this time is comfortable with the proposal as revised. Much of this proposal will return to the Commission as DP/ADLS and will be refined at that stage.

Committee Report, Rick Ripma: This project was at Committee quite some time. The majority of the Committee liked the design of the buildings, and the price range is at or above the price range of the area. There is a huge water problem in this area and with the commitments made by the developer, the drainage will be improved for this area. At one time, the City was in support of commercial in this project and the Committee did not feel that commercial was appropriate. The dissenting vote was Carol Schleif, reasoned by the lack of green space in the project.

Carol Schleif commented that the buildings are only 10 feet apart and very narrow/skimpy, you can barely get trees in. The density is very high and that is a concern. With the pond and retaining wall, the drop would require guardrails around it—if you step it back, there really is no room—you are into the homes. The amount of lot/site coverage is dictating how large the ponds are and this is a concern—guardrails will not be attractive. A lot of the units do not have views or back yards; two and one-half story townhomes would have been less massive and preferable. Is there a tree preservation plan?

Steve Pittman said there have been a lot of changes on this project—reduction in density, change in configuration of the retention ponds, no garage doors will be seen from the perimeters of the site. There is a lot of off-site infrastructure that makes it difficult, but it will be one of the best projects Pittman Partners has ever done. The ponds will help with the storage capacity of water and the Engineering Dept. has had a lot of input in this regard.

Carol Schleif commented that the court homes are absolutely stunning and she would like to see these on Westfield. The rows of townhomes are hard to dress up—they are boxes and we are decorating them a little differently. If we change from the rows to other shapes such as cubes or some other combination, and vary the roof height, it would be more aesthetically pleasing.

Steve Pittman responded that the court homes will be extremely expensive and there are only 70 of them—plenty for the area. We are also transitioning from 3 stories down to 2 stories. There are some one story around it, but if the 2 stories were moved up and the 3 stories back, it would never fly. However, all comments are appreciated.

Kevin Heber said this is really tough because of lack of guidance in the document. In addition, some vision for Westfield Boulevard in general from 96<sup>th</sup> to downtown would have been helpful, but that is not available either. This is a tough call; by itself, the project stands very well.

Rick Ripma made formal motion to forward Docket No. 06020006 PUD, Aramore PUD to the City Council with a favorable recommendation, seconded by Leo Dierckman, approved 6 in favor, one opposed (Schleif.)

## **J. New Business**

None

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 PM.

---

Jerry Chomanczuk, President

Ramona Hancock, Secretary